U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2005-109-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC62181

PROJECT NAME: Modification to Questar's Greasewood Compressor Station

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado
T. 2 S., R. 96 W.,
Sec. 8, lot 3, 6.

APPLICANT: Questar Pipeline Company

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: Questar Pipeline Company has applied to install additional piping from their compressor station at Greasewood over to the Davis Gas Plant.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is for additional piping between the Greasewood Compressor Station and the Davis Gas Plant facility. On June 18, 2004, modifications were approved for Davis Gas Plant facility. This new request is along side last year's action. Questar Pipeline Company has asked for a 35 foot wide area adjacent to the proposed new piping to be used as a temporary working area and to stockpile topsoil. The approximate length of the new piping will be 655 feet with the existing permanent right-of-way width of 50 feet (250 feet of 12-inch, 330 feet of 10-inch, and 75 feet of 8-inch pipe), which is approximately .80 acres. The additional piping will be used to handle increased natural gas production that is taking place in the area. The additional piping will allow for transfer options for the Main Line 68, TransColorado, Colorado Interstate Gas Company, and also provide Questar with a means to operate their line with more capacity.

The term of this facility will run concurrent with the original grant. All terms, conditions, and stipulations of the original grant remain in full force and effect. This action will be authorized under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended.

No Action Alternative: Under the no action alternative the application would be denied and things would remain the same.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD:

NEED FOR THE ACTION: An application has been received for additional piping to Questar's Greasewood Compressor Station.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: Pages 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: "To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of other resource values".

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements listed below:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS

AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment: The Greasewood Compressor Station is not located within a ten mile radius of any special designation air sheds or non-attainment areas. The proposed action will have little effect on air quality in the area with exception to dry periods when gusty winds may temporarily increase fugitive dust levels. Overall, construction operations should not greatly compromise National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for particulate mater which calls for a maximum 24-hour average to be less than or equal to 150 $\mu g/m^3$.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Temporary reductions in vegetal cover as a result of new pipeline construction will leave soils exposed to eolian processes.

During dry and windy periods, air quality may be compromised due to increased levels of fugitive dust originating from the newly exposed construction area. However, airborne particulate matter should not exceed Colorado air quality standards on an hourly or daily basis.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: Topsoil stockpiled in the temporary work space must be completely covered to avoid exposure to wind. Adequate ground cover must be reapplied to disturbed areas associated with pipeline construction. In addition, all disturbed areas must also be revegetated as soon as possible following construction.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed modifications to the Questar compressor facility appear to be in an area of previous disturbance (Piceance Gathering System 1957) and previous inventory (Luoma 1981 Compliance Dated 2.17/1981, Pennefather-O'Brien 1992,Compliance Dated May 1992, Scott 1992, Compliance Dated 8/03/1992, Pfertsh, Gruebel, Quick and Welch 1998) with no cultural resources located in the proposed project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed project would not impact any known cultural resources.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to cultural resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES

Affected Environment: The noxious weeds black henbane, houndstongue, yellow toadflax, mullein, and bull thistle occur throughout the project in disturbed areas associated with roads, wells, pipelines and compressor stations as a result of oil and gas development in the area. The invasive alien cheatgrass also occurs on these same sites. Noxious and invasive species continue to be a problem in the Magnolia area. Herbicidal treatment, if it occurs, is done after the noxious biennials have produced seed and therefore is of marginal value.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action will create areas of soil disturbance which, if they are not promptly and effectively revegetated, will provide safe sites for the establishment of noxious weeds and cheatgrass.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: The operator will monitor the right-of-way for a minimum of five years post construction to detect the presence of noxious and invasive species. The operator will be responsible for eradication of noxious weeds and cheatgrass on the right-of-way using materials and methods authorized in advance by the Field Manager.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: An array of migratory birds fulfills nesting functions throughout Magnolia's sagebrush and serviceberry dominated habitats from late May through early August. Species associated with these shrubland communities are typical and widely represented in the Resource Area and region. Those bird populations identified as having higher conservation interest (i.e., Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory, Partners in Flight program) include Brewer's sparrow and green-tailed towhee. These birds are well distributed and common across Magnolia's extensive sagebrush and mixed shrub habitats. This project parallels a large existing pipeline corridor that is herbaceous in character. The temporary work space would involve a 35' margin of an isolated 0.5 acre patch of big sagebrush that lies immediately adjacent to an operating compressor facility.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Project construction would occur soon after authorization and would likely coincide with the migratory bird nesting season (June and July). However, the selected pipeline corridor is situated immediately adjacent to a series of

compressor facilities and parallels a large existing pipeline corridor that possesses little, if any potential as nesting habitat for birds (i.e., herbaceous character adjacent to constant industrial activity). Likewise, the small remnant of sagebrush adjacent to the Davis plant likely has no utility as nesting habitat. The small extent and scale of this project (1.4 acres), the vegetation character of affected lands, and that fact that all potential nesting habitat lies within 200' of existing industrial sites drastically limits the utility of this parcel for migratory bird nesting, such that it would be unlikely to support more than 1 pair of breeding birds of lower conservation interest.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no effective difference from impacts discussed in the Proposed Action. The utility of this tract of land for breeding bird use would remain strongly influenced by the existing site conditions.

Mitigation: None

THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE ANIMAL SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)

Affected Environment: There are no threatened or endangered animal species known to inhabit or derive important benefit from the project locale.

The Magnolia area hosts a small, remnant population of greater sage-grouse, a BLM sensitive species, that are the target of population and habitat restoration efforts by the BLM and CDOW. The project site is situated on a narrow neck of habitat separating Magnolia's core sage-steppe habitats to the east (presently occupied by grouse) from ridgelines extending to the west and north. These westerly ridgelines support about 600 acres of former sage-steppe habitats that are now dominated by large serviceberry and encroaching pinyon pine. This part of Magnolia has probably been unsuitable for occupation by grouse for over 30 years. The project site is associated with broad pipeline right-of-way corridors that lie adjacent to a series of compressor stations and probably offers no effective utility as grouse habitat.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Pipeline installation would have no further influence on reducing the availability of (see Migratory Bird section for details), or physically obstructing access to, grouse habitats available to the west and north (i.e., currently unsuitable for use). Placement of this corridor in close proximity to a number of pre-existing facilities offers the advantage of limiting the effective expansion of development into suitable and occupied sage grouse habitats.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would potential to influence special status species. However, alternate locations would likely involve more extensive long-term removal of sagebrush habitats at locations more distant from existing forms of disturbance, thereby involving habitats with more functional value to the sage grouse population on Magnolia.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The proposed action would have no effect on the assessment of land health standards. The proposed pipeline corridor would involve a 35' wide margin of a remnant and isolated patch of big sagebrush (about 0.1 acre) that lies immediately adjacent to an operating compressor station. This habitat patch has no effective utility as grouse habitat. On a localized basis, the industrialized nature of the project area does not meet Standard 4, but at larger spatial scales and in the context of this existing industrial-dominated site, the proposed action would have no substantive influence on the health and productivity of surrounding rangelands as habitat for special status species, and thus no effect on the status of the land health standard.

WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: There are no known hazardous or other solid wastes on the subject lands. No hazardous materials are known to have been used, stored or disposed of at sites included in the project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: No listed or extremely hazardous materials in excess of threshold quantities are proposed for use in this project. While commercial preparations of fuels and lubricants proposed for use may contain some hazardous constituents, they would be stored, used and transported in a manner consistent with applicable laws, and the generation of hazardous wastes would not be anticipated. Solid wastes would be properly disposed of.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no-action alternative.

Mitigation: The applicant shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed actions.

WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)

Affected Environment: Surface Water: The proposed action is located in the Greasewood Gulch catchment area which is a tributary to Piceance Creek (tributary to the White River). A review of the Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, the 303(d) list and the Unified Watershed Assessment was done to see if any water quality concerns have been identified. The State has classified stream segment 16 of the White River Basin as "Use Protected" and further designated as beneficial for the following uses: Warm Aquatic Life 2, Recreation 2, and Agriculture. The antidegredation review requirements in the Antidegredation Rule are not applicable to waters designated use-protected. For those waters, only the protection specified in each reach will apply. For this reach, minimum standards for four parameters have been listed. These parameters are: dissolved oxygen = 5.0 mg/l, pH = 6.5 - 9.0, Fecal Coliform = 2000/100 ml, and 630/100 ml E. coli.

Ground Water: The proposed action is located in an area of ground water recharge at the head end on of Greasewood Gulch.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Surface exposure to erosional process will slightly increase sediment loads in the direction of Greasewood Gulch. However, given the minimal amount of surface disturbance and the location of the proposed action, consequences resulting from increased sediment loads will be minimal.

Construction of the pipeline will have little to no effect on ground water recharge. However, if contaminants spilled during construction are allowed to infiltrate soils, ground water quality could be compromised depending on the volume of the spill.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: Stockpiled soils in the temporary work space must be covered. Furthermore, silt fences will be positioned down gradient of stockpiled soils to prevent sediment from leaving the site. Re-apply ground cover and seed disturbed areas.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: Water quality in stream segment 16 currently meets water quality standards set by the state. During the construction period, temporary decreases in infiltration and permeability rates will result in increased sediment production from the site. However, following proper mitigation, water quality will not be greatly compromised.

WETLANDS AND RIPARIAN ZONES (includes a finding on Standard 2)

Affected Environment: There are no wetlands or riparian communities that would be directly or indirectly influenced by this proposal.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on riparian or wetland habitat.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no affect on riparian or wetland habitats under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: The proposed action would not affect achievement of the land health standard.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, Wilderness, or Wild and Scenic Rivers, threatened, endangered or sensitive plants exist within the area affected by the proposed action.

For threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species Public Land Health Standard is not applicable since neither the proposed nor the no-action alternative would have any influence on populations of, or habitats potentially occupied by, special status plants. There are also no Native American religious or environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action.

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS

The following elements **must** be addressed due to the involvement of Standards for Public Land Health:

SOILS (includes a finding on Standard 1)

Affected Environment: No fragile soils have been identified near the location of the proposed actions. The following data is a product of an order III soil survey conducted by the NRCS. The accompanying table highlights important soil characteristics. A complete summary of this information can be found at the White River Field Office.

Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Ecological site	Salinity	Run Off	Erosion Potential	Bedrock
43	Irigul-Parachute complex	12-45% / 5-30%	Loamy Slopes/ Mountain Loam	<2	Rapid	Slight to high	10-20

43-Irigul-Parachute complex (5 to 30 percent slopes) can be found on ridges and mountainsides. Areas are irregular in shape and are 20 to 250 acres in size. The native vegetation is mainly grasses and shrubs. This unit is 60 percent Irigul channery loam and 30 percent Parachute loam. The Irigul soil is mainly in convex areas, and the Parachute soil is in slightly concave areas. The components of this unit are so intricately intermingled that it was not practical to map them separately at the scale used.

The Irigul soil is shallow and well drained. It formed in residuum derived from sandstone and hard shale. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown channery loam 5 inches thick. The underlying material is brown extremely channery loam 7 inches thick. Hard sandstone is at a depth of 12 inches. Depth to hard sandstone or shale is 10 to 20 inches. Permeability of the Irigul soil is moderate. Available water capacity is very low. Effective rooting depth is 10 to 20 inches. Runoff is medium to rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is very high.

The Parachute soil is moderately deep and well drained. It formed in residuum derived dominantly from sandstone. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown loam 4 inches thick. The upper 20 inches of the subsoil is grayish brown loam channery loam, and the lower 8 inches is pale brown extremely channery sandy loam 6 inches thick. Sandstone is at a depth of 38 inches. Depth to sandstone or shale ranges from 20 to 40 inches. Permeability of the Parachute soil is moderate. Available water capacity is low. Effective rooting depth is 20 to 40 inches. Runoff is medium, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate to very high.

If this unit is seeded, the main limitations are slope, shallow rooting depth, and a short growing season. The plants selected for seeding should meet the seasonal requirements of livestock or wildlife, or both. For successful seeding, prepare a seedbed and drill in the seed.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Removal of ground cover will leave soils exposed to raindrop impact, overland flows and eolian processes. Significant precipitation events creating overland flows will potentially result in rill or gully erosion on disturbed surfaces. Stockpiled soils stored in the temporary work space will also be vulnerable to erosional processes. Leaks or spills of environmentally unfriendly substances used in the construction process may infiltrate soils rendering them unsuitable for vegetation.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: As stated in the air quality section, stockpiled soils in the temporary work space must be covered. Furthermore, silt fences will be positioned down gradient of stockpiled soils to prevent sediment from leaving the site.

To inhibit overland flows, disturbed surfaces must be revegetated with a combination of the following: beardless wheatgrass, western wheatgrass and needle grass. Also, flow deflectors and sediment traps (woody debris) shall be evenly distributed over the disturbed area to ensure soil stability. It is also recommended that the temporary work area be ripped and seeded to mitigate soil compaction in those areas.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: Temporary reductions in infiltration and permeability rates will be expected prior to mitigation in the temporary work area. The proposed actions should not greatly impact the health of upland soils following proper mitigation. In the absence of soil contamination during construction, disturbed surfaces should have the potential to support a healthy plant community.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Prior to the extensive disturbance that has occurred, the existing vegetation was a mixed stand of mountain big sagebrush and Utah serviceberry with a diverse grass/forb understory. The ecological site is rolling loam/loamy slopes.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The principal impact to vegetation will be complete removal of vegetation on the plant modification site and the earthen disturbance associated with it. In terms of plant community composition, structure and function, the principal negative impact over the long term would occur if invasive species or noxious weeds are allowed to establish and proliferate on the disturbed areas resulting from the proposed action.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: Promptly recontour and revegetate all disturbed areas with Native Seed mix #2.

Native Seed Mix #2			
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Indian ricegrass (Rimrock) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Needle and thread Globemallow	2 1 2 2 1 0.5	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial)*:* Plant communities in the project area currently meet the Standard and are expected to continue to meet the Standard following implementation of the proposed action.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: There are no aquatic habitats directly or indirectly involved with this proposal. The nearest aquatic habitat in Piceance Creek is separated from the project proposal by about 10 miles of ephemeral channel.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on aquatic wildlife or habitat.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no affect on aquatic wildlife or associated habitats under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The proposed action would have no conceivable effect on the condition or function of far-removed aquatic habitats and would, therefore, have no effective influence on land health standards for aquatic wildlife.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Big game (deer and elk) occupy the serviceberry and sagebrush steppe in and around the Magnolia complex primarily from May through November. While raptors such as red-tailed hawks may opportunistically forage throughout the area, there is no suitable substrate for raptor nesting within the immediate vicinity.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proximity of this facility to the intersection of two major county roads and the existing industrial complex limits the overall influence on big game (i.e., direct and indirect habitat loss) to negligible proportions.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no potential to affect terrestrial wildlife or associated habitats under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The landscape encompassing this industrial project site meets the land health standard for terrestrial communities. The proposed action would have no incremental effect on habitat function or conditions and, similarly, no functional influence on attributes of community health.

OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS: For the following elements, only those brought forward for analysis will be addressed further.

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Access and Transportation		X	
Cadastral Survey	X		
Fire Management	X		
Forest Management	X		
Geology and Minerals	X		
Hydrology/Water Rights	X		
Law Enforcement		X	
Noise	X		
Paleontology			X
Rangeland Management			X
Realty Authorizations			X
Recreation		X	
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources		X	
Wild Horses	X		

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located in an area mapped as the Uinta Formation (Tweto 1979) which the BLM has classified as a Condition I formation meaning it is known to produce scientifically important fossil resources.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: if it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying rock formation there is a potential to impact scientifically important fossil resources.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: there would be no new

impacts to fossil resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing paleontological sites, or for collecting fossils. If fossil materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear to be of noteworthy scientific interest
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not feasible)

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

RANGELAND MANAGEMENT

Affected Environment: The proposed action is within the Little Hills allotment (06006). The allotment is used from spring through fall by Burke Brothers as part of their yearly livestock operation on the public lands.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Soil and vegetation disturbance associated with the proposed action will result in the short and long term loss of one (1) AUM of livestock forage.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: See Native, Non-Native and Vegetation sections above.

REALTY AUTHORIZATIONS

Affected Environment: The area is being developed more extensively with the increased oil and gas production in the Piceance Basin and is a hub for several pipeline facilities.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is for the installation of additional piping between Questar's Greasewood Compressor Station and the Davis Gas Processing facilities. The new piping will be place along side piping that was installed last year. A temporary work area will be required for stockpiling topsoil and use as a

work space. There are at least 5 other compressor stations in the immediate vicinity plus numerous pipelines and metering installations.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: 1. The Colorado One Call procedure will have to be activated before any surface disturbing activities take place.

2. The reclamation plan and weed management plan will be incorporated into the right-of-way amendment and strictly adhered to.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: This action is consistent with the scope of impacts addressed in the White River ROD/RMP. The cumulative impacts oil and gas activities are addressed in the White River ROD/RMP for each resource value that would be affected by the proposed action.

REFERENCES CITED:

Luoma, Garry M.
1981 Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Socony Mobil Oil Corporation's Magnolia Camp and Auxiliary Developments in the Piceance Basin, Rio Blanco County, Colorado. Reports of the Laboratory of Public Archaeology No. 46, January, 1981. Laboratory of Public Archaeology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Pennefather-O'Brien, Elizabeth, Patrick Lubinski, and Michael D. Metcalf
1992 Colorado Interstate Gas Company Uinta Basin Lateral 20" Pipeline: Class III Cultural Resource Final Report Utah, Colorado and Wyoming. Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc., Eagle, Colorado.

Pfertsh, Jack E. Rand A Greubel, Kelly Quick and James M. Welch
1998 Class III Cultural Resource Inventory of Questar Pipeline Company Dark Canyon Interconnect Pipeline and Ancillary Facilities site, Rio Blanco County, Colorado. SWCA, Inc, Environmental Consultants, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Scott, John M.
1992 Addendum: Class III Cultural Resource Inventory of the Proposed Colorado Interstate Gas Company Greasewood Compressor Station Rio Blanco County, Colorado. Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc., Eagle, Colorado.

Tweto, Ogden
1979 Geologic Map of Colorado. United States Geologic Survey, Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED: None

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Air Quality
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Tamara Meagley	Natural Resource Specialist	Threatened and Endangered Plant Species
Michael Selle	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources Paleontological Resources
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-Native Species, Vegetation, Rangeland Management
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species
Bo Brown	Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Nate Dieterich	Hydrologist	Soils
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	Natural Resource Specialist	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Keith Whitaker	Natural Resource Specialist	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	Natural Resource Specialist	Wild Horses

Finding of No Significant Impact/Decision Record (FONSI/DR)

CO-110-2005-109-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)/RATIONALE: The environmental assessment and analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed action have been reviewed. The approved mitigation measures (listed below) result in a Finding of No Significant Impact on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary to further analyze the environmental effects of the proposed action.

DECISION/RATIONALE: It is my decision to approve the proposed action with the following mitigation measures.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

1. Topsoil stockpiled in the temporary work space must be completely covered to avoid exposure to wind. Adequate ground cover must be reapplied to disturbed areas associated with pipeline construction. In addition, all disturbed areas must also be revegetated as soon as possible following construction.

2. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

3. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

4. The operator will monitor the right-of-way for a minimum of five years post construction to detect the presence of noxious and invasive species. The operator will be responsible for eradication of noxious weeds and cheatgrass on the right-of-way using materials and methods authorized in advance by the Field Manager.

5. The holder shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by the proposed action.

6. Stockpiled soils in the temporary work space must be covered. Furthermore, silt fences will be positioned down gradient of stockpiled soils to prevent sediment from leaving the site. Re-apply ground cover and seed disturbed areas.

7. As stated in the air quality section, stockpiled soils in the temporary work space must be covered. Furthermore, silt fences will be positioned down gradient of stockpiled soils to prevent sediment from leaving the site.

8. To inhibit overland flows, disturbed surfaces must be revegetated with a combination of the following: beardless wheatgrass, western wheatgrass, and needle grass. Also, flow deflectors and sediment traps (woody debris) shall be evenly distributed over the disturbed area to ensure soil stability. It is also recommended that the temporary work area be ripped and seeded to mitigate soil compaction in those areas.

9. Promptly recontour and revegetate all disturbed areas with Native Seed mix #2.

Native Seed Mix #2			
2	Western wheatgrass (Rosanna) Indian ricegrass (Rimrock) Bluebunch wheatgrass (Whitmar) Thickspike wheatgrass (Critana) Needle and thread Globemallow	2 1 2 2 1 0.5	Deep Loam, Loamy 10"-14", Loamy Breaks, Loamy Slopes, Rolling Loam, Valley Bench

10. Seeding shall take place immediately after construction activities have been completed.

11. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing paleontological sites, or for collecting fossils. If fossil materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear to be of noteworthy scientific interest
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not feasible)

12. If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

13. The Colorado One Call procedure will have to be activated before any surface disturbing activities take place.

14. The Reclamation Plan and Weed Management Plan will be incorporated into the right-of-way amendment and strictly adhered to.

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING: Compliance will be conducted by the realty staff every five years.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Caroline Hollowed

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: Kent C. Walter
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 06/01/05

ATTACHMENTS: Location map of the proposed action.

Location of Proposed Action
CO-110-2005-109-EA